

Hampton Board of Selectmen  
Minutes of July 23, 2012

PRESENT: Richard Griffin, Chairman  
Richard Nichols, Vice Chairman  
Michael Pierce, Selectmen  
Ben Moore, Selectmen  
Philip Bean, Selectmen  
Frederick Welch, Town Manager

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

I. Public Comment

Art Gopalan, 20 Windmill Lane, Mr. Gopalan commented on the CIP and he complimented Mr. Schwotzer for his excellent analysis on the Tax impact of the CIP expenditures and the School should be included in the CIP . Mr. Gopalan also commented on the placement of the Hampton Fire Station Construction Management Services RFP Award on the Consent agenda and as he feels that a discussion should be held on it.

Discussion on Consent Agenda Item 13. Hampton Fire Station Construction Management Services RFP Award

Mr. Welch asked the Board members if they would like him to call the Fire Chief to come in to speak on this issue, as he is available to do so.

Mr. Pierce commented that he feels that it should be discussed and not be on the Consent Agenda, although all the information on the RFP award is before him.

Mr. Moore comments were that he would have asked that it be taken off the Consent Agenda, because of its size; the information on the RFP award is complete; this subject has been discussed in depth before this Board; he does not have any questions; is prepared to vote on it; and that there is no need for the Fire Chief to attend.

Mr. Bean comments were that the information on the RFP award was received in a timely fashion, is complete and very informative; Eckman was the lowest of the five bidders; the bidding process satisfies the requirement of the RFP; the Fire Chief has worked with this firm for several years; and that he supports Mr. Moore comments.

Mr. Nichols comment was that he has a real concern from a process standpoint and that items of this nature should not be on the Consent Agenda; and in the future items such as this, should be placed on the agenda as an appointment, or as new business or as old business for discussion. He is prepared to vote in favor of this tonight.

Mr. Moore MOTIONED to MOVE to Authorize Consent Agenda Item #13 as presented for \$600,368.50 to Eckman Construction Co., Inc. of Bedford, NH for Construction Management Services of the two Fire Stations as voted on at Town Meeting. Mr. Griffin SECONDED.

#### Discussion

Mr. Pierce commented that he thinks in the fairness to the Taxpayers it should be discussed with the Fire Chief, and although he is familiar with this, the voters may not be, and he has serious misgivings voting on this evening.

Chairman Griffin commented that this subject has been discussed before this Board, and that he supports approving it and the presence of the Fire Chief is not needed and he will be here next week and can answer anyone questions then.

VOTE: 4-0-1(Pierce)

Mr. Nichols MOTIONED that in the future requests of Selectmen's approval on contracts in excess of \$50,000 be place under New Business or Old Business on the Agenda. Mr. Pierce SECONDED.

VOTE: 5-0-0

## II. Old Business

1. CIP – Capital Improvement Plan
  - a. Public Works

Keith Noyes, Director of Public Works introduced his management team; Chris Jacobs, Deputy Director, Mike Dube, Wastewater Operations Manager; Frank Swift, Highway Supervisor; Tobey Spainhower, in charge of Sewer and Drains.

Mr. Noyes stated that the management team has put a lot of work in generating this CIP. And in this CIP, they have tried to address the infrastructure needs of the Town and the need for these improvements. The plan addresses the needs of the town and makes sure that the town has the right equipment to maintain infrastructure. They recognize the cost of this and this CIP is not a dream list. It is his opinion it is time the Town begins to be aggressive on improving and maintaining the infrastructure; roads, buildings, mechanical equipment, or transportation or the tools of their trade, and that the longer you wait to address the improvements for the infrastructure and the needs of the Town, the costs increase, and only gets more expensive.

Every one of these projects on this CIP will eventually need to be addressed, and deferring any one of these projects, or all of them, will not make the projects go away, and in his experience it will only be more expensive to do in the long run. They have worked hard on this, to refine the numbers, to try to get the numbers down to a reasonable amount of cost. It is a long menu of items and he appreciates the fact that because of the cost to the taxpayers, that there may not be support to do all these projects and some projects may have to be deferred or all of them. From a Public Works standpoint, it is his responsible to at least identify an outline, a plan of attack; to try to get on track and tried to be caught up on infrastructure improvements, and eventually over a period, these costs will eventually go down. Excel Sheet entitled "Project Expenditures

Summary” is in the agenda folder for the overall cost for DPW Capital Improvements Plan.

Vehicle & Equipment Capital Reserve Fund

Projected Costs	2013	\$573,000
	2014	\$501,000
	2015	\$455,000
	2016	\$555,000
	2017	\$575,000
	2018	\$340,000

The Public Works Department Vehicle & Equipment Capital Reserve was established in 2008 to fund the purchase of new vehicles and equipment. These funds could be used as a down payment, or payment in full. The advantages of having funds available when making a large capital investment include better price negotiations with manufactures, reduced interest paid on borrowed funds, and reduced impact to tax rates by maintaining consistent annual expenditures. Mr. Noyes explained the Vehicle & Equipment Replacement Plan; the plan is a 10-year plan. They have assessed the equipment and vehicles and have set up a condition rating system of 1 to 10, 1 being the best and 10 the worst, and for each of the vehicles and each of the equipment a rate was given. The plan for replacement of vehicles and equipment designed to be level over the 10-year period so there would be no spikes in the costs in each of the years for the scheduling of replacement. The information given tonight reflects a projected six-year period. Mr. Noyes explained how the rotation of the vehicles and equipment is done; in order to get the maximum use of them. They will be tracking equipment and vehicle costs that include the labor cost to present a real value to the BOS.

Frank Swift, Highway Supervisor, Mr. Swift explained how the operating budget is broken down. Mr. Swift gave a history of each of the Vehicles that the Highway Department uses and their condition and the costs to replace them.

Questions from the Board concerned the following:

Mr. Bean spoke of the department’s safety and operational intensity; replacement of and the cost of the Sweeper, it has a shorter life span then other vehicles; tracking maintenance, costs of maintenance, down time

Mr. Nichols spoke to the issue of the need for the number of the packers six with a seventh packer needed for back up.

The revised spreadsheet reflects the removal from the CIP (Capital Reserve Account) of any item under the \$75,000 amount, and items under that amount have been placed in the operating budget.

The Board discussed the revised numbers of 07/23/2012 versus 07/20/2012, and the questions asked of Misters Swift and Noyes were based on the spreadsheet dated 07/20/2012.

Mr. Moore suggested that overtime be used to offset the need to purchase the second plow truck, to forestall the purchase.

Mr. Peirce asked about the pickup and the continuation of welding the frame and what can be done to extend the life of the vehicle frame. Mr. Noyes stated it is the salt air and the sanding that quicken the frames short life, and if the vehicles could be stored inside and the installation of a Vehicle & Equipment Wash Bay will lengthen the life of vehicle.

#### Road & Sidewalk Improvements

Projected Cost            2013 – 2018    \$356,550 per year

Mr. Noyes explained the Road and Sidewalk Improvements. They are requesting this to be budgeted \$356,550 and want to continue with the warrant article of \$300,000. Last year there was a separate line item for re-surfacing but it was previously taken out of the budget, but the Budget Committee. They are requesting a general line item for road maintenance, which includes cold patch and sand and different things they need in general, and \$30,500 would be taken out of re-surfacing from the general budget and \$26,000 for Sidewalks.

Mr. Jacobs explained that they are presently using UNH students to do sign inventory, sewer manhole and drainage manhole inventory, this will compliment and update the GIS mapping they have.

The following projects that have been identified included in this budget:

1. Resurfacing
2. Sidewalks
3. Paving Mary Batchelder Road
4. Paving on Watson Road, these two are road that have reached their tipping point, to not address them now we will lose the road and it will be more expensive
5. Moulton Road, sewer replacement, and storm water drainage
6. Kings Hwy, detailed sewer and drainage replacement plan
7. Elaine, Gill, and Pearl Streets, sewer and drainage replacement plan
8. Cusack Street, Metal pipe replacement
9. Barbour Road, Drainage work in-house project
10. West Side Sewer replacement
11. Eaton Park, Culvert replacement
12. Drainage system on the Railroad Line Track
13. Downtown Hazard Mitigation Project/Grant

The goal of this project is to repair the roads, sidewalks, and municipal underground utilities in accordance with a long term and well-developed maintenance plan.

The town of Hampton has over 125 miles of roads and sidewalks and many more miles of underground pipes. The DPW is in the process of surveying and evaluating the roads and sidewalks to produce a sound long-term maintenance plan.

The older the asphalt pavement is, the more expensive it becomes to fix and/or repair. The deterioration of asphalt pavement accelerates over time as the elasticity is reduced which results in cracking and delamination. After 12 years of pavement life, the pavement deterioration greatly accelerates and becomes increasingly expensive.

Questions from the Board concerned the following:

Mr. Moore asked if this \$356,500 number is it enough to keep you for the 12-year cycle for road improvements, and Mr. Noyes said no.

Discussion ensued on the costs of theses project and Mr. Noyes asked the question to the Board on how he should identify the costs of these improvement and it was determined that a “to be determined – Cost” is better than stating a specific amount.

Mr. Nichols asked to clarify what Mr. Noyes was asking for in total amount of monies and it does not reflect the \$150,000 that was taken out by the BudCom. This question was directed at the 07/20/12 dated spreadsheet. The 07/23/12 spreadsheet does not reflect the \$150,000.

Mr. Pierce followed up with a question on the rating scheme, and the coordination with Unitil and Aquirion work on the road. Mr. Noyes clarified that that Unitil and Aquirion have to coordinate with the Town before they can work in the road, and it is five years after the completion of a road before it can be opened up.

It was suggested to Mr. Noyes that he keep the information simple when he present the information to the BudCom. Combine the three large items into one cost.

#### Sewer Collection System Improvements

Projected Cost	2013	\$120,000
	2014	\$325,000
	2015	\$2,000,000
	2016	\$2,000,000
	2017	\$3,000,000
	2018	\$3,000,000

This project would include engineering and construction to replace and/or repair the sewer collection system. The existing system is allowing over 500,000,000 gallons of infiltration into the sewer system that must be treated.

A plan for improvements will be developed subsequent to the proposed Infiltration and Inflow study and sewer collection system-mapping project.

The above figures are rough estimates that need to be refined.

#### Storm Water System Improvements

Projected Cost	2013	\$280,000
	2014	\$314,000
	2015	\$924,000
	2016	\$1,029,000
	2017	\$964,000
	2018	\$1,184,000

The above figures are rough estimates that need to be refined.

This project would include engineering and construction to replace and/or repair the storm drainage system including the cost to provide connections to properties that discharge basement water into the sewer system.

A plan for improvements will be developed subsequent to the proposed Infiltration and Inflow study and storm drain-mapping project.

Sewer & Drain Building, Vehicle/Equipment Wash Bay

Projected Cost            2013    \$500,000

(1) Sewer & Drain Division Office & Equipment/Inventory Storage Bldg.

Mr. Toby Spainhower explained how they borrow space from various departments and at various locations to store their equipment, and a lot of time is taken to response to an issue because of this. A key ingredient to the longevity and value of motorized equipment assets is protection from the adverse weather conditions presented by a saline coastal environment. The 'Sewer and Drain' section has 13 major pieces of equipment with a value exceeding \$1,000,000, exposed to harsh weather conditions, and salt laden air from the marsh twelve months of the year. This lack of proper shelter not only causes corrosion and premature failure of sensitive electronic components but also hinders employee efforts to perform basic preventive maintenance during inclement weather. Emergency response time is affected due to tools and supplies not being stored in a centralized location. Records and plans are currently at risk of damage from moisture due to the lack of proper facilities. Funding to construct a metal building, garage facility will have long-term financial benefits by reducing maintenance expenses and extending life cycle equipment replacement needs. In addition, inside storage will provide all-weather protection for employees to conduct routine tasks while promoting occupational safety.

(2) Vehicle & Equipment Wash Bay

Wash bay facilities are necessary for sanitation and preventing rust on department vehicles. For example, when rubbish packers finish their routes at the end of the day, hoppers should be washed on a daily schedule especially in summer. During winter plowing operations, equipment is utilized to load and spread road salt. Our only option is to rinse equipment in the yard usually during freezing weather. Both situations are noted as concerns in complying with our obligations under the EPA Storm Water Regulations. Funding of this proposal will have benefits of reducing rust thereby extending service life of equipment and attendant maintenance costs, while providing an all-weather facility addressing environmental standards.

The work consists of construction of an addition to the proposed Sewer & Drain garage to house high-pressure hoses and steam cleaning equipment and a grit/oil separator.

Questions from the Board concerned the following:

Mr. Nichols asked about last year's garage cost and the increase. This year more research was done and this cost is more realistic then last year. And \$100,000 is for the wash bay.

Mr. Pierce would like information that documents that washing a vehicle increase the vehicle's life. And do we now wash the trash trucks and Mr. Spainhower stated that they are cleaned, but the cleaning is plugging the drains at the Transfer Station.

The consensus of the Board was that they were in support of this item.

## Proposed Five Corners Intersection Improvement Project – Roundabout

Projected cost            2013    \$525,000 - \$620,000

Mr. Noyes gave a brief history of how poorly this intersection is design and the difficulty it is to traverse for drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists and inhibits safe pedestrian access to many of the Town's areas with its central location. This intersection has the unique configuration of five approaches with the two northerly approaches controlled through a non-standard arrangement of channelized striping. The NH DOT crash data indicates that 40 crashes have been reported at the intersection between 2002 and 2010 (average of 4.5 crashes per year). Fifteen of the crashes involved injuries. Fortunately, there have been no fatalities.

This intersection needs to be improved as soon as possible to improve public safety and traffic control.

The proposed project would include designing and constructing a new and safer intersection that meets modern design standards and improves traffic control, reduces congestion, and accommodates pedestrian and bicycle access. New sidewalks and crosswalks will be installed.

We are presently in the process of selecting and contracting a transportation-engineering firm (i.e. consultant) to produce a preliminary plan for consideration.

The preliminary work will include:

### (1) Survey Study / Conceptual Design Phase

The consultant will conduct a field survey to establish the existing conditions base plan. The work will include a topographic and detail survey of approximately five (500) hundred linear feet at each intersection approach. We estimate the total length of survey required for the project to be approximately 2,500 linear feet including the intersection. Survey will be completed to approximately 20 feet each side of roadway edge of pavement and 30 feet up each driveway along the roadways. The survey will locate and label all existing visible features including visible monumentation at property corners along the right of way, fences, stone walls, utility poles, culverts including inverts and pipe sizes, drainage structures including rims, inverts and pipe sizes, traffic signal equipment, edge of pavement and gravel surfaces, pavement markings, driveways, trees, tree lines, mailboxes, ledge outcrops and areas of landscaping. The topographic survey will include spot elevations at key locations such as at driveways, and the development of existing contour elevations. Contours will be provided at a one (1) foot interval. The plan developed will be tied to the Town's GIS coordinate system.

Research will be conducted at the Town's Planning Department and the registry of deeds to obtain available information on existing abutting properties including septic systems and wells. The approximate right of way will be determined from available information.

Using the field survey base plan, conceptual design plans will be produced at 1"=20' horizontal scale.

The consultant will conduct traffic counts at the existing intersection.

The consultant will conduct a SYNCHRO analysis of the alternative intersection configurations. It is anticipated that analyses will be conducted for up to two (2) alternative improvements for the intersection.

Analyses will include weekday, weekend AM, and PM peak hour traffic volumes conducted for the existing condition (opening year) and the future (20-year peak horizon) periods.

The consultant will provide a Preliminary Design Report to the Town and make a presentation at a future selectmen's meeting. It is anticipated that two (2) alternative conceptual design plans will be produced including: a signalized intersection (assuming signal warrants are met); a roundabout; and an alternative geometric configuration (such as offset roundabout or alternate lane configurations). The report will contain all technical data and plans to support recommendations to the Town on intersection design parameters, including roadway layout and alignment, alternatives considered for the improvements, utility impacts, identify right-of-way and easement impacts, and preliminary construction costs for the project.

Mr. Nichols questioned the increase in the cost of the Roundabout from \$250,000 to \$600,000, and Mr. Noyes stated that that cost of \$250,000 came from Durham as they did one, and the cost of the \$600,000 was the estimate from the Engineer.

Mr. Pierce is in support of a Roundabout, but could we do one each of the large project for the intersection improvements in each of the years forward and that is the plan.

#### WWTP Facilities Plan

Projected Cost            2013    \$350,000

Mr. Dube explained that this is proactive facility plan. The goal of this project is to update the 201 Facilities Plan produced in 1986 by Underwood Engineers and the last one was done in 2006 by FST and this is to address new requirements anticipated to be issued with the new NHDES permit issuance in 2012 -2013.

The town built the first wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) in 1936. The facility was upgraded in 1975 through 1977 to provide secondary treatment. In 1979, the town voted to update the master plan by preparing a 201 Facilities Plan. It wasn't until 1983 work on the plan started and in 1984 a sewer system evaluation study was performed which was the basis for the 201 Facilities Plan. The plan identified problems in five categories:

1. Construction to replace pumping stations
2. Construction to replace overloaded sewers
3. Construction to serve areas with failing septic systems
4. Construction for WWTP improvements

Expansions and upgrades throughout the years have not kept up with the necessary maintenance and repair of these facilities. This became known recently when major problems developed at the WWTP, which resulted in the NH DES issuing an order to the town requiring certain improvements. In addition, the town's 5-year EPA wastewater discharge permit has expired and it is anticipated that the new permit will include a number of new requirements and parameters that will be expensive to address.



The new Facilities Plan will review the condition of the existing plant and the new NHDES requirements along with consideration of future growth and potential energy savings as the basis for formulating recommendations and a facilities plan is necessary for identifying the improvements needed to the WWTP.

#### Questions from the Board

Mr. Moore asked whether the facility update plan a requirement to get a permit and it is not. He asked if the plan could be done in house, if the resources were there. Mr. Noyes stated that we would need a professional engineer to do the paperwork if we are looking to receive SRF. He explained that he would want a large engineering firm to do this because of their extensive experience, as EPA may come out with new stringent permit regulations. The permit renewal is something we are doing, the facility plan is not a requirement for the permit, but we are required to do the EPA permit, and the facilities plan will help with the unknown cost of what may be required under the permit.

Mr. Bean congratulated Mr. Dube for his promotion. His question is for further discussion, with that large amount of money, is the contributing Towns to our Wastewater Treatment Plant facility being adequately assessed, and secondly he compliments the staff for their work.

Mr. Nichols questioned the cost increase of \$350,000, what caused it to increase from \$100,000 last year. Mr. Noyes explained that the cost was generated from asking an engineering firm about the I/I Study that he is proposing. That cost includes a plan for improvements to the overall system that includes flow metering testing non-rain events versus rain events. It was clarified that both plans combined would cost \$700,000.

The CIP last year, was a best-shot effort as he had just begun, and he qualified that that CIP was done not knowing the landscape of all the facilities at DPW and the cost figures were not adequate.

#### Winnacunnet/Landing Road Intersection

Projected cost                \$300,000

Creation of a T-Intersection and would be done in-house. This is a very dangerous intersection. It was mentioned that the utility pole is a known obstacle.

#### Winnacunnet and Lafayette Road

The final cost should be included in the CIP. The cost sharing is 80/20 percent. It was suggested that this should go to the voters as a warrant article. Mr. Noyes would like to fast track this for 2013 and if it does go to Town meeting it would postpone the work to 2014 and the cost will increase.

Phase 2                2013    \$200,000                Compliance with NH DES Administrative Order by  
Consent No# 11-006WD

Pursuant to the AOC the Town is being required to improve sludge monitoring and handling within the Hampton WWTF to include at a minimum 1) automated primary sludge control valve, 2) sludge flow, level and density measurement and recording instruments for its primary sludge and thickened primary sludge; 3) primary sludge pumps to ensure uniform sludge withdrawal from the primary clarifiers; 4) dilution water



treatment costs are projected to increase significantly and the clean water that enters the treatment facility does not need to go through the expensive treatment process.

The Hampton wastewater collection system consists of approximately 68 miles of wastewater pipes and 1,600 manholes. Many of these pipes and manholes are old (clay) and deteriorated (cracks) which allows clean water seepage into the pipes and ultimately the treatment plant. Also, many buildings discharge cellar and/or foundation drain water into their wastewater discharge pipe, which ends up at the treatment plant for treatment.

This work will include: Data collection and review, field investigations including flow monitoring, pipe cleaning and videoing, smoke testing, manhole inspections, house-to-house survey, mapping, and cost estimates for improvements.

It is estimated that a half million gallons of infiltration is being treated, and it is important to get this out of the system as the cost to treat it is increasing. And the total amount of inflow is increasing and when we reach 80% we will need to rebuild the plant.

#### Final Comments

Mr. Bean thanked Keith and his management team and Mr. Moore for driving this meeting.

Mr. Nichols understands the discussion tonight is seeing the world from DPW's point of view, he feels that this CIP is too aggressive in its financial impact; as it increases the taxes every year; increases long term debt, and using the same amount of the UFB from last year does not help relieve the tax debt, there will be increases. The taxpayer as he believes will be less able to pay for these things in the next few years. In addition, the other items/costs that are unknown; should be on the radar; are not included in this such as CBA impacts; EPA relicensing costs; and the Meadow Pond and other ponds, the rail corridor need to be on the radar, even if there is no number associated with them, and they need to be addressed. The exclusion of large items such as the 9 mil Community Center and 1 mil Campbell Ball Park that were in last year's CIP and dropped for this last year because of the new rules as referenced by the Parks and Rec Director.

Mr. Welch explained that there were no new rules, the ruling was that what is submitted to the CIP it needed to be something that is viable; that they will be pursued, and that a warrant article will be submitted for that item. Mr. Welch asked the Parks and Rec Director about those items, her admission was that those items are not viable and are way out past the 6-year plan.

Mr. Moore commented to Selectmen Nichols is, the only way that works; to keep the tax rate at some lower level of increase; is to assume that we are not going to have any problems, and the people will live with road conditions that will deteriorate or with the sewer system that ends up at the WWTP that exceeds the EPA daily capacity levels because of infiltration, and we get hit hard with a EPA directive that we have to do something. He agrees with him that we can still manage how much is spent each year and in total on these efforts, and perhaps we will tone it down. We do not want to give the community the impression just because we do not spend the money, that we are kicking the can down the road. We need to address the issues, but take smaller bites. Mr. Nichols is not advocating that we do nothing; he is advocating that we cannot do as much as contained in the CIP.

Chairman Griffin agrees that you can only kick the can down the road for so long, and that is what has been done in Hampton for many years. Concerning the flooding at King's Hwy, in the past Meadow pond was dredged and the flooding would be not as bad and if that could be done now it might help with the flooding now.

Chairman Griffin complimented the DPW on the team approach and thanked them.

Mr. Welch commented that they will be on the budget on Wednesday and this material will contribute greatly to that study and dissertation.

### III. Consent Agenda

1. Revised 2008, 2009 & 2010 Tax Year Sewer Abatements Refunds
2. Charmingfare Farm – Taxi Business License – John Pyteraf
3. Charmingfare Farm – Taxi Operator's License – Zachary Curtis
4. Charmingfare Farm – Use of Church Street Parking for the Horse Trailer
5. Request Use of Town Property – 2 Beach Plum Way – Wedding on 08/04/2012
6. ~~Dance Hall Permit "Stacey Jane's" – 9 A Ocean Blvd~~
7. Liquor License Request of Top Shelf Brew, LLC – 826 Lafayette Road
8. 2012 Supplemental Dog Warrant
9. ~~Resident Decal "\$20,500 1-yr Goal" Future Funds – Holding Account~~
10. One Day Entertainment License "Terri's Run" Motorcycle Benefit & Cookout" 07/28/12
11. Raffle Permit "Terri's Run" Motorcycle Benefit & Cookout"
12. Parade and Public Gathering License "Terri's Run" Motorcycle Benefit & Cookout"
13. ~~Hampton Fire Station Construction Management Services RFP Award~~

#### Discussion on the Consent Agenda

Removal of the Resident Decal "\$20,500 1-yr Goal" Future Funds – Holding Account as the amount was incorrectly noticed, the amount is \$25,000, and will be discussed next week on how to create a special revenue funds and the fees will be directed to that fund and not spent.

Fee charged for the parking spaces at Church Street Parking Lot for the Charmingfare Farm. There will be two spaces used by Charmingfare Farm.

Removal of Stacy Jane's Dance Hall permit as some research needs to be done regarding the restriction.

Removal of Hampton Fire Station Construction Management Services RFP award as it was discussed and approval at the beginning of the meeting.

Mr. Moore MOTIONED to MOVE the Consent Agenda with the exception of items #6, #9, and #13. Mr. Griffin SECONDED.

VOTE: 5-0-0

### IV. Selectmen's Closing Comments

Discussion regarding the memo about the packer that was discussed last week, the memo explains that there was miscommunication amongst the staff, and that there was no

malice done to the taxpayers as it was human error, and that disclosure of this should have been done at the meeting. The Board determined that a process of review and approval (a tracking format) would be done when the bids are being brought to them for approval.

Discussion on purchasing policy and procedures, bid process and approval. It was determined that the Department Heads will be versed in the updated purchasing policy and procedures, bid process and approval to ensure that they are conforming to the new policy.

#### V. Adjournment

Mr. Pierce MOTIONED to adjourn the public meeting. Mr. Moore SECONDED.

VOTE: 5-0-0

---

Chairman